

for such a course, except a desire to have anything but a fair election, by permitting the registrars to exercise arbitrarily the power placed in their hands.

To turn attention from their villainous schemes, a host of "detectives" was named, and charged to be in the employ of the People's Party, when that party knew absolutely nothing of such persons. This was done to assail the character of a few who had been successful in unearthing "Liberal" frauds; and as another step in its infamy, alleged "telegrams" were posted as being sent by W. A. Pinkerton, from Chicago, defaming the character of certain persons. These telegrams have been shown to be forgeries, by the testimony of Mr. Pinkerton himself.

These are a few of the conditions which have been developed in connection with the "Liberal" plot openly declared in the party's organ. It is with the voters of Salt Lake to say whether or not this plot shall succeed. We have no hesitancy in saying that every honest and intelligent voter will place himself on record against the outrage.

To every legal voter in this city we say: It is your duty as a citizen and a defender of your country to go to the polls on Feb. 10th, and deposit your ballot for the men of your choice. This is a time when every man should be found at his post of duty. Be at the polling places early, and vote for the men who will give the city good government. These men are those whose names are on the People's Ticket.

Quite a number of residents of the city have been away on business that rendered it necessary for them to leave town just at this season. But every one of them who has the interests of the community at heart, and who is not absolutely prevented getting here, has turned his face homeward to meet the great peril that is facing the people. Our delegate in Congress is one among this number. He was expected last evening, but failed to arrive. The following dispatch shows the cause of his detention, but gives assurance of his vote for the right on Monday:

UNION DEPOT, Council Bluffs,  
Iowa, February 7, 1890.

Hon. Franklin S. Richards:

I leave for Salt Lake by the fast mail tonight. Had intended to witness the close of the campaign on Saturday night, but was detained by a washout east of Chicago. God willing, I will be there on Monday to cast my ballot for the People's candidates.

JOHN T. CAINE.

Mr. Caine is only one among thousands of our citizens who will be found on hand at the polls, voting for the same candidates. The People's Party know that a fair election means certain victory for them. They want only honest votes. They do not need nor will they get any others. It is the record of the party that, while some honest votes are cast against them all dishonest ballots are also found on the side of the opposition. But this latter class would do well to have a care on Monday. There is more than empty words in the

following notice issued by the People's committee:

#### ILLEGAL VOTERS BEWARE!

Take due notice! Under the laws of congress and of Utah Territory, any person who votes at an election without having previously taken the registration oath, or who subscribes to that oath, and was not a resident of this Territory six months and of the precinct one month previous to the day of his registration, is guilty of a felony, and is liable to a fine of \$1000 and imprisonment in the penitentiary for two years, for illegal registration and for illegal voting; and also to a further penalty of ten years imprisonment for perjury.

This is to warn all persons who attempt to vote illegally on Monday, Feb. 10, 1890, that they will be prosecuted to the full extent of the criminal law.

The "six million dollar" syndicate to protect those who might be caused a feeling of uneasiness with the foregoing notice will hardly find it as pleasant a proceeding as they might suppose. The People's Party have not, and do not now seek to keep out legal voters. To them they offer all protection within their power. But the man whose name is illegally on the registration list, and who casts a ballot that he has no right to, is the one who will be prosecuted. *Legal voters need no syndicate to defend them; and no syndicate is strong enough to give protection to illegal voters.* The latter class have reason to fear.

#### THE REGISTRARS "DECIDE."

Following is the decision of the deputy registrars as to those who have been polygamists, but are not now:

*Before the Board of Registrars of Salt Lake City, Utah.*

In the matter of the challenge of D. Webb vs. B. Y. Hampton et al.

These are cases in which the right of defendants to remain on the registry list of Salt Lake City is challenged on the ground that they are polygamists. The evidence shows that each of the defendants has, at some period since the passage of the anti-polygamy law of 1862, entered into the relationship of bigamy or polygamy.

Section 1 of the act of 1862 provides as follows: "Every person having a husband or wife living who shall marry another person \* \* \* shall be adjudged guilty of bigamy," etc.

Man violates the law, and the law fixes his status. The act of the individual consists in the marrying, the operation of the law in adjudging him a bigamist. It is true the individual places himself by his own act in antagonism to the law, but did the law not step in and fix his status, no such result would follow. In other words, it is not the individual but the law that fixes his status.

Section 8 of the Edmunds law provides: "That no polygamist, bigamist or any person cohabiting with more than one woman \* \* \* shall be entitled to vote."

Section 24 of the Edmunds-Tucker act provides as follows: "No person who has been convicted of any crime under this act \* \* or who shall be a polygamist, or who shall associate or cohabit polygamously with persons of the other sex, shall be entitled to vote."

In this section disfranchised persons are classified. First—Those who have been convicted, etc. Second—Those who are polygamists. Third—Those who associate or cohabit polygamously with persons of the other sex.

Now we think that no one will for an instant contend that a person who has been convicted of the crimes enumerated could, by any act on his own part, restore his franchise. Not even a life of penitence and disavowal of his crime could change his condition. When he was convicted, the law stepped in and disfranchised him, and nothing short of the pardoning hand of the President of the United States can restore him to civil rights. This principle is too well established to admit of controversy.

Let us next consider the second class, to wit, polygamists. The law defines the term, and makes those who commit the act guilty. This class does not include those who have been tried and convicted, but merely those who have committed the act only. When the individual has done the act, the law says he is a polygamist. In what respect does the second class differ from the first, other than that of intensity? The status in both cases is fixed by one and the same law. If, therefore, the act of disavowal will change the status in one case, why not in the other. If the proposition that once a convict always a convict until pardoned, be true, then why not the same rule in polygamy? In one case the act leads to the disfranchisement, in the other the conviction. In the Ramsey case, the Supreme Court of the United States say that a polygamist or bigamist "can only cease to be such when he has finally and fully dissolved, in some effective manner, which they were not called on to point out, such relationship."

We have been unable to find any decision which points out "that effective manner," and are of the opinion that the point under consideration has never been adjudicated. The statute has prescribed a way by which the status of a polygamist may be changed, that of amnesty by the President (Sec. 7, Edmunds Law), which in our opinion is the only manner in which it can be done. In the language of Chief Justice Zane, "Amnesty is the remission of the consequences of a crime, and may be after as before there is a conviction." Bennett decision.

Disfranchisement is the consequence of the crime of polygamy, and without amnesty the disability remains. The crime of polygamy is consummated and, in fact, wholly included in the act of marrying, having a wife living and undivorced. The after act of living with or separate from his wives does not in the least effect his status. In the